

FACT SHEET

Title and Description of Proposal

The Cedar River Watershed Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) is a 50-year, ecosystem-based plan which is intended to fulfill Endangered Species Act (ESA) requirements for all City operations in the Cedar River Watershed. These operations include all land management activities, such as timber harvesting; water supply operations, such as water withdrawals and management of reservoir levels; and the operation of hydroelectric facilities. The HCP document essentially functions as an application for an Incidental Take Permit (ITP) from the federal government in order to allow the City to continue operating in the Cedar River Watershed if the conservation measures in the HCP are implemented. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) are the responsible federal agencies. The plan has been designed to both provide certainty for the City's drinking water supply and to protect and restore habitats of 83 species of fish and wildlife that could be affected by City of Seattle (City) operations.

In return for extensive commitments to conservation and mitigation measures, an approved HCP would permit the City to maintain its utility operations on the Cedar River while simultaneously protecting all species addressed by the plan, as required by the ESA. In addition to issues governed by the ESA, the Cedar River Watershed HCP addresses related resource issues with the State of Washington and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. The plan encompasses land and forest management in the Municipal Watershed, mitigation for the blockage to anadromous salmon and trout at the City's Landsburg drinking water intake, regulation of stream flows in the Cedar River, as well as research and monitoring to support the conservation and mitigation measures in these three major components of the plan.

Action Sponsor

City of Seattle

Lead Agencies

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Marine Fisheries Service are the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) lead agencies. The City of Seattle is the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) Lead Agency.

Responsible Officials*NEPA:*

Thomas J. Dwyer
Deputy Regional Director
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
911 N.E. 11th Avenue
Portland, OR 97232

William Stelle, Jr.
National Marine Fisheries Service
7600 Sandpoint Way N.E.
Seattle, WA 98115

SEPA:

Diana Gale, Director
Seattle Public Utilities
10th Floor Dexter Horton Building
710 Second Avenue
Seattle, WA 98104

Contacts

Jon Hale, NEPA Compliance Officer
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
510 Desmond Drive, Suite 102
Lacey, WA 98503-1273
(360) 753-4371

Jim Erckmann, Watersheds Programs Manager
Seattle Public Utilities
19901 Cedar Falls Road S.E.
North Bend, WA 98045
(206) 233-1512

**Permits, Licenses and
Other Approvals
Required**

Implementing the HCP will involve the construction and operation of habitat mitigation improvements. Depending on the exact timing and configuration of these improvements, permits may include:

Army Corps of Engineers Section 404 Permit
Army Corps of Engineers Section 10 permit
Washington Hydraulic Project Approval
Washington Forest Practices Permit
Washington Temporary Modification of Water Quality Standards
King County Building Permit
King County Shoreline Substantial Development Permit
King County Grading Permit

Authors and Principal Contributors to the Final EIS	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service National Marine Fisheries Service Seattle Public Utilities Foster Wheeler Environmental and subconsultants
Internet	http://www.ci.seattle.wa.us/util/watershed/cedar/hcp.htm
Date of Issue of Final EIS	May 27, 1999
Date and Nature of Final Action	Final action is approval by the Seattle City Council to fund the activities covered by the HCP and the ESA ITP and to enter an agreement with the USFWS and NMFS to meet the obligations outlined in the HCP and ITP. The Council is expected to act on the HCP in July 1999.
Type and Timing of Subsequent Environmental Review	Depending on the exact nature of the actions to be taken to achieve the mitigation measures embodied in the HCP, additional SEPA review may be required related to forest management, Landsburg mitigation, and in the adoption of the instream flow regime.
Location of Background Data	Because of the technical breadth and complexity of the HCP there is voluminous background information. Please contact Jim Erckmann to obtain access to any background data.
Cost to Public of this Final EIS	A limited number of copies of the complete EA/Final EIS and the associated Response to Public Comments document may be available to public agencies, organized citizens groups, and private citizens at no charge. Requests to receive documents should be made by calling (206) 684-4144. The complete EA/Final EIS has been widely distributed throughout the City, County, and University Library systems for easy access by the public.

**ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT/
FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT
FOR THE PROPOSED ISSUANCE
OF A PERMIT TO ALLOW
INCIDENTAL TAKE OF THREATENED
AND ENDANGERED SPECIES**

**CEDAR RIVER WATERSHED
DRAFT HABITAT CONSERVATION PLAN**

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
National Marine Fisheries Service
City of Seattle

May 1999

**ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT/FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT
STATEMENT FOR THE PROPOSED ISSUANCE OF A PERMIT TO ALLOW
INCIDENTAL TAKE OF THREATENED AND ENDANGERED SPECIES**

**DRAFT CEDAR RIVER WATERSHED HABITAT CONSERVATION PLAN
CITY OF SEATTLE**

May 1999

Lead Agencies:

City of Seattle
USDI U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
DOC NOAA National Marine Fisheries
Service

Responsible Officials:

Thomas J. Dwyer
Deputy Regional Director
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
911 N.E. 11th Avenue
Portland, OR 97232

William Stelle, Jr.
National Marine Fisheries Service
7600 Sandpoint Way, N.E.
Seattle, WA 98115

Diana Gale, Director
Seattle Public Utilities
710 Second Ave
Seattle, WA 98104

For Further Information Contact:

Jim Erckmann
Seattle Public Utilities
Watersheds Management Division
19901 Cedar Falls Road S.E.
North Bend, WA 98045

Brian Bogaczyk
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
510 Desmond Drive, Suite 102
Lacey, WA 98503-1273

Matt Longenbaugh
National Marine Fisheries Service
510 Desmond Drive, Suite 101
Lacey, WA 98503-1273



Publications

Issued May 27, 1999:

Response to Public Comments on the Public Review Draft of the Environmental Assessment/Environmental Impact Statement for the Cedar River Watershed Habitat Conservation Plan. May 1999.

Final Environmental Assessment/Environmental Impact Statement for the Issuance of a permit to allow Incidental take of Threatened and Endangered Species. May 1999.

Issued December 10, 1998:

Draft Cedar River Watershed Habitat Conservation Plan for the Proposed Issuance of a Permit to Allow Incidental Take of Threatened and Endangered Species. Public Review Draft, December 1998.

Draft Environmental Assessment/Environmental Impact Statement for the Proposed Issuance of a Permit to Allow Incidental Take of Threatened and Endangered Species. Public Review Draft, December 1998.

Executive Summary for the Draft Cedar River Watershed Habitat Conservation Plan and the Draft Environmental Assessment/Environmental Impact Statement. Public Review Draft, December 1998.

Resource Maps for the Cedar River Watershed Habitat Conservation Plan and Environmental Assessment/Environmental Impact Statement. Public Review Draft, December 1998.

Technical Appendices for the Cedar River Watershed Habitat Conservation Plan and Environmental Assessment/Environmental Impact Statement. Public Review Draft, December 1998.



Contents

1. INTRODUCTION	1-1
1.1 Purpose and Need of Proposed Actions	1-2
1.1.1 Applicant's Purpose and Need	1-3
1.1.2 The Services' Purpose and Need	1-3
1.2 Plan Objectives	1-4
1.3 Cedar River Municipal Watershed Study Area	1-8
1.4 Decisions to be Made	1-12
1.4.1 FWS and NMFS Decisions	1-12
1.4.2 City of Seattle Decisions	1-13
1.5 Environmental Review	1-14
1.5.1 The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)	1-14
1.5.2 SEPA and Chapter 25.05 of the Seattle Municipal Code of Seattle	1-15
1.5.3 Coordination of NEPA and SEPA	1-15
1.6 Development of the HCP Proposal	1-16
1.7 Public Involvement and the Scoping Process	1-16
1.7.1 The Scoping Process	1-22
1.7.2 Scoping Meetings	1-22
1.7.3 Comments Received During Scoping Process	1-23
1.7.4 Release of Draft Documents for Public Review	1-25
1.7.5 Public Workshops and Public Hearings	1-26
1.7.6 Comments received on the EA/EIS	1-28
1.8 Process for Finalizing the Proposed HCP and Issuing the ITP	1-28
1.9 Overview of the Remaining Chapters	1-29
2. ALTERNATIVES	2-1
2.1 Introduction	2-1
2.2 Development of Alternatives	2-2

Contents (continued)

2.2.1 Proposed HCP Alternative	2-2
2.2.2 No Action Alternative	2-2
2.2.3 Reasonable Alternatives	2-3
2.3 Alternatives Considered	2-4
2.3.1 Watershed Management Alternatives (WM)	2-4
2.3.2 Anadromous Fish Mitigation Alternatives (AFM)	2-15
2.3.3 Instream Flow Alternatives (IF)	2-31
2.4 Previous and Future Environmental Analyses Related to this Proposal	2-42
2.4.1 Previous Analyses	2-42
2.4.2 Future Analyses	2-43
2.5 Effects of Deferring the Proposed Action	2-45
2.6 Conclusion	2-45
3. AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT	3-1
3.1 Geology and Soils	3.1-1
3.1.1 Physiography	3.1-1
3.1.2 Geology	3.1-3
3.1.3 Soils	3.1-4
3.1.4 Geomorphic Processes	3.1-5
3.1.5 Summary	3.1-13
3.2 Water Resources	3.2-1
3.2.1 Water Quantity	3.2-2
3.2.2 Water Quality	3.2-26
3.2.3 Summary	3.2-32
3.3 Forest Resources	3.3-1
3.3.1 Introduction	3.3-1
3.3.2 Successional Stages, Forest Stand Ages, and Vegetation Types	3.3-1
3.3.3 Commercial Timber Distribution	3.3-7
3.3.4 Current Management and Silvicultural Practices	3.3-11
3.3.5 Silvicultural Practices	3.3-12
3.3.6 Silvicultural Systems	3.3-15
3.3.7 Summary	3.3-18
3.4 Fisheries Habitat and Resources	3.4-1
3.4.1 Fish Resources and Distribution	3.4-2
3.4.2 Fisheries Habitat	3.4-29
3.4.3 Summary	3.4-43
3.5 Wildlife	3.5-1

Contents (continued)

3.5.1 Habitats	3.5-1
3.5.2 Key Wildlife Communities and Species of Concern	3.5-8
3.5.3 Habitat Fragmentation and Connectivity	3.5-28
3.5.4 Summary	3.5-30
3.6 Cultural Resources	3.6-1
3.6.1 Introduction	3.6-1
3.6.2 Affected Environment	3.6-2
3.6.3 Previous Cultural Resources Studies	3.6-2
3.6.4 Cultural Resources Evaluation	3.6-5
3.6.5 Summary	3.6-6
3.7 Land Use	3.7-1
3.7.1 Introduction	3.7-1
3.7.2 Land Use Plans and Zoning	3.7-2
3.7.3 Other Planning Documents Affecting Land Use	3.7-3
3.7.4 Existing Land Use	3.7-5
3.7.5 Summary	3.7-7
3.8 Recreation	3.8-1
3.8.1 Introduction	3.8-1
3.8.2 Cedar River Municipal Watershed	3.8-2
3.8.3 Cedar River Basin Below Landsburg Diversion	3.8-3
3.8.4 Lake Washington to Puget Sound	3.8-6
3.8.5 Summary	3.8-9
3.9 Public Services	3.9-1
3.9.1 Introduction	3.9-1
3.9.2 Seattle Public Utilities—Potable Water	3.9-1
3.9.3 Seattle Public Utilities—Flood Control	3.9-4
3.9.4 Seattle City Light—Hydroelectric Generating Plant	3.9-5
3.9.5 Summary	3.9-7
3.10 Socioeconomic Conditions	3.10-1
3.10.1 Introduction	3.10-1
3.10.2 Population	3.10-2
3.10.3 Labor Force and Unemployment	3.10-4
3.10.4 Employment	3.10-5
3.10.5 Summary	3.10-16
4. ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES	4-1
4.1 Geology and Soils	4.1-1
4.1.1 Mass Wasting	4.1-1
4.1.2 Road Surface Erosion	4.1-8

Contents (continued)

4.1.3 Hillslope Erosion	4.1-11
4.1.4 Soil Productivity	4.1-12
4.1.5 Anadromous Fish Mitigation Alternatives	4.1-14
4.1.6 Instream Flow Alternatives	4.1-14
4.1.7 Summary	4.1-15
4.2 Water Resources	4.2-1
4.2.1 Watershed Management Alternatives	4.2-1
4.2.2 Anadromous Fish Mitigation Alternatives	4.2-7
4.2.3 Instream Flow Alternatives	4.2-13
4.2.4 Summary	4.2-16
4.3 Forest Resources	4.3-1
4.3.1 Introduction	4.3-1
4.3.2 Vegetation Modeling Assumptions and Limitations Common to All Alternatives	4.3-1
4.3.3 Effects on Successional Stages and Commercial Timber Volumes	4.3-2
4.3.4 Effects on Rare Plants	4.3-25
4.3.5 Effects on Noxious Weeds	4.3-27
4.3.6 Anadromous Fish Mitigation Alternatives	4.3-28
4.3.7 Instream Flow Alternatives	4.3-28
4.3.8 Summary	4.3-28
4.4 Fisheries Habitat and Resources	4.4-1
4.4.1 Effects of Watershed Management Alternatives on Fish Habitat	4.4-1
4.4.2 Anadromous Fish Mitigation Alternatives	4.4-8
4.4.3 Effects of Instream Flow Alternatives	4.4-50
4.4.4 Summary	4.4-94
4.5 Wildlife	4.5-1
4.5.1 Key Habitats and Wildlife Communities	4.5-2
4.5.2 Other Habitats	4.5-17
4.5.3 Habitat Fragmentation and Connectivity	4.5-22
4.5.4 Species with Individual Conservation Strategies	4.5-25
4.5.5 Anadromous Fish Mitigation Alternatives	4.5-37
4.5.6 Instream Flow Alternatives	4.5-38
4.5.7 Summary	4.5-41
4.6 Cultural Resources	4.6-1
4.6.1 Cultural Resources Policy and Management	4.6-1
4.6.2 Watershed Management Alternatives	4.6-2
4.6.3 Anadromous Fish Mitigation Alternatives	4.6-6
4.6.4 Instream Flow Alternatives	4.6-7
4.6.5 Summary	4.6-8

Contents (continued)

4.7 Land Use	4.7-1
4.7.1 Introduction	4.7-1
4.7.2 Watershed Management Alternatives	4.7-1
4.7.3 Anadromous Fish Mitigation Alternatives	4.7-2
4.7.4 Instream Flow Alternatives	4.7-3
4.7.5 Summary	4.7-3
4.8 Recreation	4.8-1
4.8.1 Introduction	4.8-1
4.8.2 Watershed Management Alternatives	4.8-1
4.8.3 Anadromous Fish Mitigation Alternatives	4.8-3
4.8.4 Instream Flow Alternatives	4.8-8
4.8.5 Summary	4.8-15
4.9 Public Services	4.9-1
4.9.1 Introduction	4.9-1
4.9.2 Watershed Management Alternatives	4.9-1
4.9.3 Anadromous Fish Mitigation Alternatives	4.9-4
4.9.4 Instream Flow Alternatives	4.9-7
4.9.5 Summary	4.9-11
4.10 Socioeconomic Effects	4.10-1
4.10.1 Introduction	4.10-1
4.10.2 Economic Impacts of Watershed Management Alternatives	4.10-2
4.10.3 Financial Effects of Watershed Management Alternatives	4.10-8
4.10.4 Economic Impacts of Anadromous Fish Mitigation Alternatives	4.10-11
4.10.5 Instream Flows	4.10-17
4.10.6 Summary and Conclusion	4.10-18
4.11 Overall Summary of Environmental Consequences	4.11-1
5. ENVIRONMENTAL CONSULTATION AND PERMIT REQUIREMENTS	5-1
5.1 Environmental Consultation	5-1
5.2 Permit Requirements	5-1
6. GLOSSARY OF TERMS	6-1
7. BIBLIOGRAPHY	7-1
APPENDIX A CULTURAL RESOURCES	

Figures

Figure 1-1. Coordinated NEPA and SEPA processes assuming submittal and approval of an HCP and signing of an Implementation Agreement	1-30
Figure 3.1-1. Variation of net root strength over time	3.1-7
Figure 3.1-2. Potential road-generated sediment, normalized, by subbasin (after Foster Wheeler Environmental, 1995d)	3.1-12
Figure 3.2-1. Cedar River Municipal Watershed - Average Annual Precipitation	3.2-3
Figure 3.2-2. Cedar River Near Cedar Falls, Washington - Streamflow Statistics	3.2-5
Figure 3.2-3. Taylor Creek Near Selleck, Washington - Streamflow Statistics	3.2-6
Figure 3.2-4. Schematic of Cedar River water supply system	3.2-7
Figure 3.2-5. Cedar River Accretion Flows between Landsburg and Renton - Streamflow Statistics	3.2-10
Figure 3.2-6. Cedar River at Renton, Washington - Streamflow Statistics	3.2-11
Figure 3.2-7. Cedar River at Renton and Landsburg Diversion - Average Annual Flows	3.2-12
Figure 3.2-8. Drainage configuration of Cedar River prior to construction of the Lake Washington ship canal and diversion of the Cedar River from the Black and Duwamish Rivers to Lake Washington	3.2-15
Figure 3.2-9. Cedar River at Renton, Washington - Water Year 1984	3.2-19
Figure 3.2-10. Cedar River at Renton, Washington - Water Year 1981	3.2-20
Figure 3.2-11. Cedar River at Renton, Washington - Water Year 1993	3.2-21
Figure 3.4-1. Approximate life history timing of sockeye, chinook, and coho salmon and steelhead trout in the Lake Washington watershed	3.4-4
Figure 3.10-1. Annual Population Change for King County, City of Seattle and Suburbs, 1981-1996	3.10-3
Figure 3.10-2. Growth in Population and Water Consumption, Seattle Water System, 1980-1997	3.10-3
Figure 3.10-3. Total and Aerospace Employment and Net Migration in King County, 1971-1996	3.10-4
Figure 3.10-4. Civilian Labor Force in King County, 1980-1996	3.10-5
Figure 3.10-5. Total Employment in King County, 1980-1996	3.10-6

Figures (continued)

Figure 3.10-6. Timber Harvests in King County by Type of Ownership, 1980-1996 (in thousands of board feet, Scribner)	3.10-7
Figure 3.10-7. Timber Harvests for All Landowners within the Cedar River Municipal Watershed, 1986-1997 (in thousands of board feet, Scribner)	3.10-8
Figure 3.10-8. Cedar River Municipal Watershed Timber Sales: City of Seattle Public Utilities Timber Harvest Receipts, 1990-1997	3.10-9
Figure 3.10-9. Annual Catch of Lake Washington Sockeye Salmon, 1980-1996	3.10-10
Figure 4.1-1. Moderate and high mass wasting hazard in non-reserve areas (matrix lands) (matrix lands) by alternative (WM3 and WM5 omitted)	4.1-3
Figure 4.2-1. Existing road density by subbasin	4.2-3
Figure 4.2-2. Cedar River at Renton, Washington - Streamflow Statistics	4.2-14
Figure 4.3-1. Seral stage projections for WM-1	4.3-5
Figure 4.3-2. Seral stage projections for WM-2	4.3-13
Figure 4.3-3. Seral stage projections for WM-3	4.3-17
Figure 4.3-4. Seral stage projections for WM-4	4.3-21
Figure 4.3-5. Seral stage projections for WM-5	4.3-24
Figure 4.4-1. Relationship between stream flow and the quantity of salmon spawning and rearing habitat as expressed by Weighted Useable Area determined by the Instream Flow Incremental Method for a single study area in the Cedar River.	4.4-54
Figure 4.4-2. Relationship between flows measured at Landsburg as compared to flows measured at Renton.	4.4-59
Figure 4.4-3. Approximate Life history timing of sockeye, chinook, and coho salmon and steelhead trout in the Cedar River	4.4-60
Figure 4.4-4. A comparison of normal minimum flows at Renton. The figure displays the existing IRPP flows, or No Action Alternative flows, as compared to the Proposed HCP Alternative flows. The flows required to create maximum weighted useable area (WUA) as defined by the IFIM study for key life history stages are displayed.	4.4-64
Figure 4.4-5. A comparison of normal minimum flows at Landsburg. The figure displays the existing IRPP flows, or No Action Alternative flows, as compared to the Proposed HCP Alternative flows. The flows required to create maximum weighted useable	

Figures (continued)

area (WUA) as defined by the IFIM study for key life history stages are displayed.	4.4-65
Figure 4.4-6. A comparison of critical flows at Renton. The figure displays the existing IRPP flows, or No Action Alternative flows, as compared to the Proposed HCP Alternative flows. The flows required to create maximum weighted useable area (WUA) as defined by the IFIM study for key life history stages are displayed.	4.4-66
Figure 4.4-7. A comparison of critical flows at Landsburg. The figure displays the existing IRPP flows, or No Action Alternative flows, as compared to the Proposed HCP Alternative flows. The flows required to create maximum weighted useable area (WUA) as defined by the IFIM study for key life history stages are displayed.	4.4-67
Figure 4.8-1. Modeled Monthly Flows for Cedar River at Renton (WY 1929 to 1993)	4.8-13

Tables

Table 2-1. Comparison of Watershed Management Alternatives	2-13
Table 2-2. Comparison of alternatives for anadromous fish mitigation	2-27
Table 2-3. Minimum normal, minimum critical and supplemental instream flow commitments included in the Proposed HCP Alternative Page 1 of 2	2-35
Table 2-4. Comparison of the No Action and Proposed HCP Alternatives for instream flows	2-41
Table 3.3-1. Current forest stand age and seral stage distribution for the Cedar River Municipal Watershed (in acres)*	3.3-4
Table 3.3-2. Old growth forest in the Cedar River Municipal Watershed by elevation	3.3-4
Table 3.3-3. Endangered, threatened, and sensitive vascular plants of King County, Washington	3.3-7
Table 3.3-4. Summary of timber harvest within the Cedar River Municipal Watershed (all ownerships) ^{1/}	3.3-10
Table 3.3-5. Estimates of timber harvest in the Cedar River Municipal Watershed 1986 through 1997	3.3-11
Table 3.4-1. Comparison of the life history characteristics of stream- type and ocean-type races of eastern Pacific chinook salmon (summarized from Healey 1991).	3.4-6
Table 3.5-1. Key wildlife communities and constituent species of concern in the Cedar River Watershed HCP (page 1 of 2)	3.5-2
Table 3.5-2. Key wildlife habitats in the Cedar River Municipal Watershed	3.5-4
Table 3.10-1. King County Population, 2000-2020	3.10-4
Table 3.10-2. Employment in King County by Major Industry Groupings, 1980-1996 (in thousands)	3.10-6
Table 3.10-3. Estimated Catch of Lake Washington Sockeye, 1980- 1996	3.10-12
Table 3.10-4. Manufacturing Employment in King County, 1996	3.10-13
Table 3.10-5. Seattle Public Utilities Water Division: Actual 1997 and Forecasted 1998 Operating Revenues	3.10-15
Table 4.1-1. Summary of Environmental Consequences Evaluated for Geology and Soils	4.1-18
Table 4.2-1. Flood Frequency Table for Cedar River as measured at the USGS Stream Gage No. 12117500, located above Landsburg at river mile 23.4 (Raytheon, 1998)	4.2-15

Tables (continued)

Table 4.2-2. Summary of Environmental Consequences Evaluated for Water Resources	4.2-19
Table 4.3-1. Summary of timber harvest modeling constraints by alternative	4.3-3
Table 4.3-2. Forest seral stages (in acres) for the years 1997, 2020, and 2050 both inside and outside the Reserve for the Watershed Management Alternatives.	4.3-6
Table 4.3-3. Commercial timber harvest average acres and average volumes per year by alternative for decades 1 to 5	4.3-7
Table 4.3-4. Total acres harvested by silvicultural system over the next 50 years by alternative	4.3-9
Table 4.3-5. Commercial base zones, acreage, prescribed volume removal, and period available for commercial thinning under Alternative WM-4 (see Map 20)	4.3-19
Table 4.3-6. Summary of Environmental Consequences Evaluated for Forest Resources	4.3-31
Table 4.4-1. Cost allocation (in millions of dollars) for mitigation measures among alternatives	4.4-12
Table 4.4-2. Likelihood for meeting conservation objectives for anadromous fish	4.4-40
Table 4.4-3. Key instream flow considerations used by the CRIFC during development of proposed HCP flow regime for anadromous fish in the lower Cedar River.	4.4-61
Table 4.4-4. Comparison of the IF-1 and IF-2 instream flow regimes	4.4-68
Table 4.4-5. Summary of expected minimum flows in the Upper Cedar Study Area located upstream of Landsburg Diversion under IF-2.	4.4-89
Table 4.4-6. Summary of Environmental Consequences Evaluated for Fisheries Habitat and Resources	4.4-96
Table 4.5-1. Summary of Environmental Consequences Evaluated for Wildlife Resources	4.5-45
Table 4.6-1. Summary of Environmental Consequences Evaluated for Cultural Resources	4.6-9
Table 4.7-1. Summary of Environmental Consequences Evaluated for Land Use	4.7-4
Table 4.8-1. Summary of Environmental Consequences Evaluated for Recreation	4.8-17
Table 4.9-1. Summary of Environmental Consequences Evaluated for Public Services	4.9-13

Tables (continued)

Table 4.10-1. Summary of Timber harvest-related Employment and Earnings Effects Under the No Action Alternative (WM-1)	4.10-3
Table 4.10-2. Total Annual Economic Impact of Cedar River Municipal Watershed Timber Harvest for WM-1	4.10-4
Table 4.10-3. Summary of Timber harvest-related Employment and Earnings Effects Under the Proposed HCP Alternative (WM-2)	4.10-5
Table 4.10-4. Summary of Timber harvest-related Employment and Earnings Effects Under the Commercial Thin Alternative (WM-3)	4.10-6
Table 4.10-5. Summary of Timber harvest-related Employment and Earnings Effects Under the Thinning Alternative Designed to Phase Out Commercial Timber Harvest (WM-4)	4.10-7
Table 4.10-6. Estimated Revenues of Timber Management Program Under No Action Alternative for Watershed Management (WM-1)	4.10-8
Table 4.10-7. Estimated Revenues of Timber Management Program Under Proposed HCP Alternative for Watershed Management (WM-2)	4.10-9
Table 4.10-8. Estimated Revenues of Timber Management Program Under Long-term Sustainable Thinning Alternative (WM-3)	4.10-9
Table 4.10-9. Estimated Revenues of Timber Management Program Under Thinning Alternative Designed to Phase Out Commercial Timber Harvest (WM-4)	4.10-10
Table 4.10-10. Rate Impact of Financing HCP Under Long-Term Sustainable Thinning Alternative (WM-3)	4.10-10
Table 4.10-11. Rate Impact of Financing HCP Under Thinning with Phased Out Commercial Timber Harvest Alternative (WM-4)	4.10-11
Table 4.10-12. Rate Impact of Financing HCP Under No Commercial Timber Harvest Alternative (WM-5)	4.10-11
Table 4.10-13. Direct and Total Economic Impacts Related to Construction, Operations & Maintenance, and Research Mitigation Activities for Proposed HCP Alternative AFM-2	4.10-13
Table 4.10-14. Direct and Total Economic Impacts Related to Construction, Operations & Maintenance, and Research Mitigation Activities for Alternative AFM-3	4.10-15
Table 4.10-15. Direct and Total Economic Impacts Related to Construction, Operations & Maintenance, and Research Mitigation Activities for Alternative AFM-4	4.10-16

Tables (continued)

Table 4.10-16. Direct and Total Economic Impacts Related to Construction, Operations & Maintenance, and Research Mitigation Activities for Alternative AFM-5	4.10-17
Table 4.10-17. Summary of Environmental Consequences Evaluated for Socioeconomics	4.10-19
Table 4.11-1. Watershed management alternatives (WM-1 to WM-5) overall environmental consequences summary	4.11-3
Table 4.11-2. Anadromous fish mitigation alternatives (AFM-1 to AFM-5) overall environmental consequences summary	4.11-9
Table 4.11-3. Summary comparison of the environmental consequences of the instream flow alternatives (IF-1 and IF-2) on life history stages of salmon and steelhead in the Cedar River downstream of Landsburg Diversion	4.11-15

List of Technical Appendices (Published in Separate Volume December 1998)

Technical appendices referenced in the Draft Cedar River Watershed Habitat Conservation Plan and the Draft Environmental Assessment/Environmental Impact Statement are contained in a separate volume. This document will be updated and re-issued with the HCP. Technical appendix numbering does not necessarily reflect the order in which they are discussed in the particular documents.

Technical Appendix 1. Implementation Agreement for the City of Seattle's Cedar River Watershed Habitat Conservation Plan

Technical Appendix 2. DCA93OI 5 Cooperation Agreement between the City of Seattle and the Washington Department of Fisheries for the Cedar River Interim Sockeye Salmon Restoration Project. December 30, 1993.

Technical Appendix 3. Sockeye Salmon Escapement Goal for the Cedar River. Washington Department of Fisheries. May 16, 1977.

Technical Appendix 4. Potential Sockeye Salmon Escapement for the Cedar River Above Landsburg. Washington Department of Fisheries. July 1997.

Technical Appendix 5. Analysis of Water Quality Impacts of Allowing Anadromous Fish Above Landsburg. CH2M Hill. 1996.

Technical Appendix 6. Landsburg Fish Passage Facilities Planning Report. Montgomery Watson. 1996.

Technical Appendix 7. Sockeye Hatchery Conceptual Design. Montgomery Watson. 1996

Technical Appendix 8. Estimated Accretion Flows in the Cedar River

Technical Appendix 9. Long Range Regional Water Conservation Plan. Seattle Water Department. Conservation Office. 1996.

Technical Appendix 10. Water Shortage Contingency Plan. Seattle Water Department. 1993.

Technical Appendix 11. City of Seattle Water Claim for the Cedar River.

List of Technical Appendices (continued)

Technical Appendix 12. City of Seattle Ordinance #114632. Cedar River Watershed Secondary Use Policies.

Technical Appendix 13. Forest Management Guidelines for the Cedar River Watershed.

Technical Appendix 14. Dates and Lists of Participants for Workshops Conducted by the City of Seattle to develop the Cedar River Habitat Conservation Plan.

Technical Appendix 15. Summary of the Cedar River Watershed Assessment.

Technical Appendix 16. Watershed Assessment Prescriptions for the Cedar River Watershed.

Technical Appendix 17. Cedar River Watershed Transportation Plan Summary.

Technical Appendix 18. List of Experts who Contributed Taxonomic Input for the Listed Species of Concern.

Technical Appendix 19. Summary of the Fish Entrainment in Masonry Pool Report by Foster Wheeler Environmental Corporation. 1998.

Technical Appendix 20. Executive Summary of Wetland Monitoring Studies, Chester Morse Lake. Raedeke and Associates. 1997.

Technical Appendix 21. Temperature Graphs of Upper Cedar and Rex Rivers. Seattle Public Utilities. 1998.

Technical Appendix 22. Chester Morse Lake Level Elevations and Upper Watershed Streamflow Graphs. Seattle Public Utilities. 1998.

Technical Appendix 23. 1997 Fish Survey of the Walsh Lake Basin. Seattle Public Utilities. 1998.

Technical Appendix 24. Select Definitions from the Washington Administrative Code.

Technical Appendix 25. Technical Memorandum on upgrading the Interim Soceye Hatchery for Alternative AFM-4.

List of Technical Appendices (continued)

Technical Appendix 26. Summary Sockeye Salmon Technical Committee Meeting on the Relative Strengths and Weaknesses of a Hatchery and Spawning Channel. December 1995.

Technical Appendix 27. Instream Flow Agreement for the Cedar River.

Technical Appendix 28. Landsburg Mitigation Agreement for the Fish Barrier at the Landsburg Diversion Dam.

Maps (Published in Separate Volume December 1998)

All of the maps for the Draft Cedar River Watershed Habitat Conservation Plan and the Draft Environmental Assessment/Environmental Impact Statement are contained in a separate document entitled Volume 3 — Resource Maps for the Cedar River Watershed Habitat Conservation Plan and Environmental Assessment/Environmental Impact Statement. This map document will be updated and re-issued with the HCP. The numbering scheme/order is arranged by map category and does not necessarily reflect the order in which they are discussed in the particular documents.

Map Number	Map Title
1	Major and Minor Hydrological Subbasins
2	Cedar River Watershed and its Environs
3	Land Ownership
4	Existing Forest Stand Age
5	Existing Habitat Coverage
6	Site Productivity for Forest Growth within Administrative Boundary
7	Known Fish Distribution
8	Mass Wasting/Landslide Potential
9	Surface Erosion Potential within Administrative Boundary
10	Road Erosion Potential
11	Transportation System
12	Composite of All Alternatives for Ecological Reserve Design
13	Ecological Reserve Design No Action Alternative (WM-1)
14	Projected Habitat Coverage No Action Alternative (WM-1)
15	Ecological Reserve Design HCP Alternative (WM-2)
16	Elements of Ecological Reserve HCP Alternative (WM-2)
17	Projected Habitat Coverage HCP Alternative (WM-2)

List of Technical Appendices (continued)

Map Number	Map Title
18	Ecological Reserve Design Long-term Sustainable Thinning Alternative (WM-3)
19	Projected Habitat Coverage Long-term Sustainable Thinning Alternative (WM-3)
20	Ecological Reserve Design Thinning Alternative with Phased-out Commercial Timber Harvest (WM-4)
21	Projected Habitat Coverage Thinning Alternative with Phased-out Commercial Timber Harvest (WM-4)
22	Ecological Reserve Design No Commercial Timber Harvest Alternative (WM-5)
23	Projected Habitat Coverage No Commercial Timber Harvest Alternative (WM-5)
24	Composite of All Alternatives for Projected Habitat Coverage at Year 2050

Acronyms and Abbreviations

ACOE	United States Army Corps of Engineers
AIP	Agreement in Principle for the Cedar River Habitat Conservation Plan
AFM	Anadromous Fish Mitigation
AOC	assimilable organic carbon
ARM	Anadromous Fish Mitigation
BIBI	Benthic Index of Biological Integrity
BLM	Bureau of Land Management
BMPs	Best Management Practices
BOD	biological oxygen demand
CCF	crown competition factor
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
cfs	cubic feet per second
CHU	Critical Habitat Unit
CMAI	Culmination of Mean Annual Increment
CML	Chester Morse Lake
CPUE	Catch Per Unit Effort
CRIFC	Cedar River Instream Flow Committee
CRMP	Cultural Resources Management Plan
CWA	Cascades Water Alliance
DA	US Department of Agriculture
dbh	diameter at breast height
DBPs	disinfection by-products
D/DPA	Disinfectants/Disinfection By-product Rule
DNS	Determination of No Significance
DO	dissolved oxygen
DOC	United States Department of Commerce
DOI	United States Department of the Interior
EA	Environmental Assessment
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement
EPA	United States Environmental Protection Agency
ESA	Endangered Species Act (of 1973)
ESUs	Ecologically significant units
ESWTR	Enhanced Surface Water Treatment Rule
FEMAT	Forest Ecosystem Management Assessment Team
FERC	Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
FONSI	Finding of No Significant Impact
FPA	Forest Practices Act
FPR	Forest Practice Rules
FPS	Forest Protection System
FR	Federal Register
FRI	Fisheries Research Institute
FWS	US Fish and Wildlife Service
GIS	Geographic Information Systems
HCP	Habitat Conservation Plan

Acronyms and Abbreviations

(continued)

IA	Implementation Agreement
ID Team	Interdisciplinary Team
IF	Instream Flow
IFA	Instream Flow Agreement
IFIM	Instream Flow Incremental Methodology
IHN	Infectious Hematopoietic Necrosis
IHNV	Infectious Hematopoietic Necrosis Virus
IRPP	Instream Resources Protection Program
ITP	Incidental Take Permit
JARPA	Joint Aquatic Resources Permit Application
kg	Kilograms
kV	Kilovolt
LMA	Landsburg Mitigation Agreement
LS	Late Successional (Forest)
LSR	Late Successional Reserve
LWD	Large Woody Debris
MCL	Maximum Contaminant Level
mg/L	milligrams per liter
MGD	million gallons per day
MMBF	million board feet
msl	Mean Sea Level
MW	Megawatt
N/R/F/D	nesting, roosting, foraging and dispersal
NAP	Natural Area Preserve
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NHPA	National Historic Preservation Act
NMFS	National Marine Fisheries Service
NOI	Notice of Intent
NRHP	National Register of Historic Places
NTU	nephelometric turbidity units
O&M	Operation and Maintenance
OAHP	Office of Archaeology and Historic Preservation
OG	Old-Growth (Forest)
PCT	Pre-Commercial Thinning
PEM	Palustrine Emergent (wetlands)
PHS	Priority Habitats and Species
PMF	Probable Maximum Flood
PPI	Parr Production Index
PSS	Palustrine Scrub/Shrub (wetlands)
RCW	Revised Code of Washington
ROS	Rain-on-snow
RM	River Mile

Acronyms and Abbreviations

(continued)

SDWA	Safe Water Drinking Act
SEPA	State Environmental Policy Act
SIS	Stand Information System
SMA	Special Management Area
SNAP	Scheduling and Network Analysis Program
SOF	Statement of Findings
SOS	Snow-on-snow
SOSEAs	spotted owl special emphasis areas
SPU	Seattle Public Utilities; formerly the Seattle Water Department
SWD	Seattle Water Department
SWTR	Surface Water Treatment Rule
T&E	Threatened and Endangered (species)
TOC	Total Organic Carbon
TSI	Tacoma-Seattle Intertie
TTHMs	Total Trihalomethanes
ug/L	micrograms per liter
USFS	United States Forest Service
USGS	United States Geological Survey
WAC	Washington Administrative Code
WDF	Washington Department of Fisheries
WDFW	Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
WDNR	Department of Natural Resources (Washington State)
WDOE	Washington Department of Ecology
WDOH	Washington Department of Health
WDW	Washington Department of Wildlife
WFLMP	Washington Forest Landscape Management Project
WM	Watershed Management
WNHP	Washington Natural Heritage Program
WUA	Weighted Usable Area

Acronyms and Abbreviations (continued)

***THROW THIS PAGE
OUT***

May 27, 1999

RE: NEPA EA/Final SEPA EIS for the Cedar River Watershed Habitat Conservation Plan

Dear Interested Party:

The enclosed Final NEPA EA/SEPA EIS on the City of Seattle's (City) Cedar River Watershed Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) has been prepared in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)(40 CFR Parts 1500-1508), the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA)(RCW 43.21C), and the Seattle SEPA Ordinance, Chapter 25.05 SMC. NEPA lead agency status is shared by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS). The City of Seattle is the plan proponent and SEPA lead agency.

The HCP is a 50-year, ecosystem-based plan that is intended to fulfill Endangered Species Act (ESA) requirements for all City operations in the Cedar River Watershed. These operations include all land management activities, such as timber harvest; water supply operations, such as water withdrawals and management of reservoir levels; and the operation of hydroelectric facilities. The HCP document functions as an application for an Incidental Take Permit (ITP) from the Federal government that will allow the City to continue operating in the Cedar River Watershed if the conservation measures in the HCP are implemented. The HCP has been designed both to provide certainty for management of the City's drinking water supply and to protect and restore habitats of 83 species of fish and wildlife that could be affected by City operations.

In return for extensive commitments to conservation and mitigation measures, an approved HCP would permit the City to maintain its utility operations on the Cedar River while simultaneously protecting all species addressed by the plan as required by the ESA. In addition to issues governed by the ESA, the Cedar River Watershed HCP addresses related resource issues with the State of Washington and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. The plan encompasses land and forest management in the municipal watershed, mitigation for the blockage to anadromous salmon and trout at the City's Landsburg drinking water intake, regulation of stream flows in the Cedar River, as well as research and monitoring to support the conservation and mitigation measures in these three major components of the plan.

Objectives meeting City and Federal needs are outlined in the EA/Final EIS. Alternatives meeting those objectives are described and analyzed. Potential environmental impacts, both positive and negative, of the programmatic elements of the HCP principally include those associated with differing levels of timber harvest of the land management

alternatives, the effects of establishing streamflows protective of species addressed by the HCP, and the hatchery and habitat alternatives which are considered as mitigation for the Landsburg blockage.

Requests for copies of the EA/Final EIS and associated Response to Public Comments document may be made by calling (206) 684-4144. The City may charge an at-cost fee for multiple copy requests. The public may also examine review copies that have been distributed to all branches of the Seattle Public Library system; to the Suzallo, Engineering, Fisheries, and Forestry Libraries at the University of Washington; and to all branches of the King County Library system.

As provided in Section 25.05.680B SMC related to SEPA, the procedural and substantive adequacy of this EIS is appealable to the Seattle Hearing Examiner no later than June 11, 1999. Appeals shall be in writing, accompanied by a \$50.00 filing fee and shall be filed with the Seattle Hearing Examiner, 1320 Alaska Building, 618 2nd Avenue, Seattle, Washington 98104. Appeals shall indicate factual objection to the EIS and the basis for the appeal of the adequacy of the EIS. The hearing examiner rules are found under Chapter 3.02 of the Seattle Municipal Code and should be consulted for a full explanation of hearing procedures. Contact the Seattle Hearing Examiner at (206) 684-0521 to ask about the procedures for SEPA appeals.

The Executive of the City of Seattle will make separate substantive recommendations on changes to the Draft HCP to the Seattle City Council. The Seattle City Council has tentatively scheduled a public hearing on the Final Executive Recommendation on the HCP for June 15, 1999 from 5 p.m. to 8 p.m. Please call the City Council to confirm the date and time, (206) 684-8888. Final Council action is expected in July 1999, with subsequent submission of a final HCP and application for an Incidental Take Permit (ITP). The Services will make their final determinations for the ITP based on the final HCP submitted.

Sincerely,

DIANA GALE

Director, Seattle Public Utilities